DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 233 440 EA 015 862

AUTHOR Duke, Daniel L.; Jones, Vernon F.
TITLE Assessing Recent Efforts to Reduce Student Behavior Problems.
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 55p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 11-15, 1983).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Problems; *Classroom Techniques; *Discipline Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Student Behavior; Suspension; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Supply and Demand; Theories; Violence

ABSTRACT

The theory, research, and prescription done during the 1970's in the areas of classroom management and school discipline are reviewed in this analysis, and the effects of this work on student behavior problems is assessed. An analysis of the sociopolitical context in which scholarly models, research paradigms, and systems for running schools were created is followed by a review of this scholarship, which concludes that no consensus exists on the best method of handling or studying behavior problems. A section inquiring whether schools have improved synthesizes literature on the level of concern of various groups responding to behavior problems, changes in student behavior, changes in educators, and changes in schools. The conclusion is that improvements in students' and educators' behaviors have not been demonstrated, but changes in school organization include formalization of disciplinary codes, the growth of alternative schools, the introduction of material dealing with student behavior into the curriculum, the development of alternatives to suspension, and increased community involvment. A discussion of future prospects anticipates the impact of teacher shortages and declining resources in the 1980's. Conclusions are summarized, and policy makers are urged to assess school environments systematically, to make schoolwide plans for improvement, to offer more comprehensive staff development programs, and to integrate various models, paradigms, and systems. (MJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Printed in USA

ED233440

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Vernon F. Jones

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ASSESSING RECENT EFFORTS TO REDUCE STUDENT BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS

Daniel L. Duke and Vernon F. Jones
Lewis and Clark College

1983

AERA
1983

EA 015 862

Few concerns during the history of American public education have spawned, over such a brief period of time, so much program development, staff training, scholarly inquiry, press coverage, policymaking, and intense feelings on the part of parents and professionals as the contemporary student discipline "crisis." What surfaced during the mid-sixties as student unrest and alienation had grown by the seventies into a nationwide rejection by large numbers of young people of the rules and conventions by which schools and homes had been run for over a century. On campuses throughout the United States reports abounded of truancy, class disturbances, vandalism, alcohol and drug abuse, and criminal assault. The very roots of the school as an instrument of social control appeared to have been shaken.

In response to these alarming developments, a variety of actions by educators, public agencies, and citizen groups were taken. To date, however, no systematic effort has been made to comprehend the magnitude or impact of these attempts to regain control of the schools. This paper derives from our desire to inventory and assess what was done between 1970 and 1980 to deal with student behavior problems. We also try to identify some unresolved issues facing researchers and speculate on what the future holds for educators.

While various terms were used over the last decade to describe our area of inquiry, two in particular seemed to enjoy widespread popularity. Classroom management emerged as the most common general label for teacher efforts to control student behavior in class. The other term - school discipline - subsumed classroom management as well as provisions for handling student behavior outside of class - in corridors and cafeterias, before and after school, on school busses and in unsupervised parts of campuses.

In our quixotic quest to understand the current state of classroom management

and school discipline, we depart somewhat from standard practice. First, no effort is made to systematically review empirical research. A number of competent reviews already exist and we draw on them where appropriate (Brophy, 1982; Brophy and Putnam, 1979; Duke and Seidman, 1982; Feldhusen, 1979; Jones, 1982; O'Leary and O'Leary, 1976). Our concern lies less with comparing and contrasting the results of assorted studies than with comprehending - in an historical sense - what happens when the attention and skills of researchers and practitioners alike and the resources of school systems, governments, and private foundations are trained on a pervasive social concern such as student behavior. We hope this somewhat unusual focus will make the following analysis useful to policymakers as well as educators and educational researchers.

A second way in which we depart from convention involves our status as "participant observers." Rather than writing as if we were outside the world of classroom management and school discipline, we openly acknowledge and draw on our practical experience. We have had the benefit over the past decade of looking at student behavior from an assortment of perspectives - classroom teacher, special educator, school administrator, clinical psychologist, researcher, program developer, staff trainer, consultant, teacher educator, administrator educator, and parent. We have worked with thousands of teachers, administrators, and concerned laymen across the country in hundreds of workshops and courses. We have conducted studies of troubled schools and developed systems for reducing behavior problems. We do not claim that our experiences make us the best persons to undertake a "state of the art" piece, only that they have generated a sufficient number of unanswered questions and unresolved issues to warrant our "taking stock."

Taking Stock

In 1970 the publication of Jacob Kounin's Discipline and Group Management in Classrooms inaugerated a decade rich in scholarly models to direct professional practice, paradigms to guide research, and systems for running schools. Before inventorying these academic enterprises in the following section, it may be helpful to describe some aspects of the socio-political context in which they occurred.

Probably no event did more to rivet public and professional attention to student behavior than the annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes toward Public Education. Since its inception in 1969 this poll, supported by Phi Delta Kappa and published each fall in its journal, has found school discipline to be the public's number one educational concern in every year but one. The 1982 Poll (Gallup, 1982) indicated that 27% of those sampled (4% more than in 1981) felt that "lack of discipline" was the biggest problem facing local schools. Further, seven out of every ten respondents regarded discipline problems in their local schools as either "very" or "fairly" serious. When respondents were asked to indicate what they meant by the term "discipline," however, answers covered a range of possibilities - obeying rules, teacher control, respect for teachers, student unwillingness to learn, fighting, and so on.

In response to this widespread but somewhat ill-defined concern over the behavior of the young, actions have been taken on a variety of fronts. At the federal level, for example, the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, headed by Birch Bayh, conducted numerous hearings in the early seventies. A nationwide survey of 757 school systems - commissioned by the group - resulted in publication of Our Nation's Schools - A Report Card: 'A' In School Violence and Vandalism. Alarm over reported increases in student behavior problems prompted Bayh to sponsor an amendment to the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (1974). Entitled the Juvenile Delinquency in the Schools Act, the amendment

dramatized the fact that the locus of youthful crime was rapidly shifting from the streets to the schools.

Other studies followed in the wake of the Subcommittee's deliberations. Among the most influential was The Safe School Study Report to the Congress - Violent Schools - Safe Schools - carried out by the National Institute of Education (NIE) and the Research Triangle Institute and published in 1978. Based on a mail survey of 4,000 elementary and secondary schools, the study found that eight percent of the nation's schools were characterized as having "serious" behavior problems. NIE also formed a Student Suspension Committee to coordinate the reevaluation of federal efforts to reduce suspensions. A two-day conference, held in April 1978, produced In-School Alternatives to Suspension (Garibaldi, 1979), a manual of suggestions for ways to sanction students without denying them access to an education. The foci of this pair of governmental efforts illustrate a major dilemma American educators currently face - How can student behavior problems be controlled without limiting access to schooling?

In addition to NIE's efforts, the Department of Justice became involved in student behavior issues. Under the auspices of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), studies of school-based delinquency and drug use were commissioned and technical assistance was provided to local educators and law enforcement officials (Rubel, 1977). The Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, concerned over reports that minority youth were subject to a disproportionately high percentage of disciplinary actions in schools, also began to play a role. In 1975 it started to require local schools to document disciplinary actions involving minority students in an effort to minimize discriminatory practices (Neill, 1975, p. 286).

Governmental activity related to school discipline was not limited to the federal level. During the seventies many state governments addressed student

behavior problems by sponsoring legislation, hosting conferences and hearings to boost public and professional awareness, and urging teacher preparation programs to offer training in classroom management. One of the first states to take action was New Jersey. In March 1969, the State Board of Education requested every school district to submit a specific plan for coping with potential student disorder (Phi Delta Kappan, February 1970, p. 334). In Florida a Governor's Task Force on Disruptive Youth was formed in 1974 to survey the causes of behavior problems and how schools were dealing with them (Rollin, 1974). California was one of the states most actively engaged in efforts to understand and reduce student behavior problems. Playing a leadership role in these activities, State Attorney General George Deukmejian took the unprecedented action of filing a Lawsuit to Restore Safety in the Schools against Los Angeles Unified School District in 1980 (Campus Strife, 1980/1, pp. 2-4). He questioned the constitutionality of requiring students to attend unsafe schools and laid the responsibility for ensuring law and order on the Board of Education's doorstep.

Deukmejian's efforts illustrate the growing role of the court system in school discipline. The late sixties and early seventies were marked by landmark Supreme Court decisions concerning student rights. Tinker v. Des Moines Community School District(1969) established the principle that students have constitutional rights such as freedom of speech. Goss v. Lopez (1974) determined that students facing suspension were entitled to due process. Wood vs. Strickland (1974) questioned the evidence necessary to justify suspension and raised the possibility that school board members could be sued for improper suspension. By 1975, however, the focus of court decisions had begun to shift from greater student rights to upholding the discretionary authority of educators. Baker v. Owen (1975) supported the right of school officials to use a "reasonable" amount of corporal punishment in disciplining students, even if parents objected. By decade's end it was clear that the courts

had come to regard schools as rule-governed organizations and that the rules, as well as the sanctions for disobeying them, were subject to legal review.

While government agencies were learning more about the extent of student misconduct and courts were reviewing school discipline policies, educators during the seventies actively sought practical solutions. It would be difficult to locate a major school district in the United States that did not offer at least one staff development program or workshop related to classroom management and school discipline.[1] New roles, such as security guards and crisis teachers, were created to help cope with problematic behavior. Even alternative schools and programs were created for students who refused or were unable to conform to the rules and practices of conventional classrooms.

Practitioners received considerable assistance during this period from a legion of consultants specializing in student behavior problems, professional organizations and unions, and higher education. For example, guidelines for school discipline and training materials were developed by the National Education Association, American Federation of Teachers, National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Association of School Security Directors, Phi Delta Kappa, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, and National School Boards Association. At the bargaining table, teacher representatives fought for and won greater protections against student misconduct.

Scholarly output in areas related to student behavior was prodigious during the seventies. Hundred of books, articles, and pamphlets were published. They ranged from a yearbook on classroom management by the National Society for the Study of Education (Duke, 1979) to brief case studies of effective programs in local schools. An appreciation for the growth of scholarly interest in student behavior

---

1. The NEA reported in 1977 that 68 percent of American teachers had participated in some form of district inservice during the preceding three years. See Status of the American Public School Teacher 1975-76 (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1977), p. 34.

problems can be gained by comparing coverage of the subject in Phi Delta Kappan in the years 1970 and 1980. In 1970 three major and five minor articles appeared in the ten issues of the widely circulated journal. A decade later, there were eleven major and sixteen minor articles. By 1980, a Special Interest Group on Classroom Management had been formed within the American Educational Research Association to provide a common forum for the burgeoning ranks of researchers in the area.

The seventies also found teacher educators working to provide better preparation in classroom management for prospective teachers. Many colleges and universities replaced the ubiquitous unit on student behavior in introductory educational psychology and methods courses with a full course on classroom management. Some states mandated that teachers-in-training evidence competence in managing student behavior. By the close of the decade, the Educational Testing Service was preparing to add a section on classroom management to the National Teacher Examination.

In summary, the seventies witnessed an unprecedented level of activity related to student behavior problems. Over the course of the decade the focus of this activity shifted somewhat, first from student unrest and demonstrations to crime and violence on campus, then to order and productive behavior within classrooms. Still, by 1980 few critics of the schools could look back and claim that a sincere effort had not been made to address the public's number one educational concern. Schools that had been indicted in the early seventies as major causes of student misconduct were being asked, ten years later, to stay open during the summer in order to keep young people calm and engaged in worthwhile activities (Kurz, 1982, p. 1). Educators who once had been subjected to parental criticism for lack of control were sponsoring workshops for parents on how to provide discipline in the home. It now is necessary to consider the extent to which ten years of human energy and policy development have really made a difference. In the next section, we look at the increased knowledge base regarding the etiology of student behavior problems and their treatment.

Subsequent sections focus on actual changes in students, teachers, and schools.

A Decade of Theory, Research and Prescription

The quest for methods to reduce disruptive behavior as well as increase student achievement prompted the development of numerous theories and research studies during the past decade. These scholarly activities have been characterized by an increasing degree of sophistication and clarity. The traditional notion of discipline, with its focus on controlling or "curing" students, now shares the spotlight with classroom management. The latter term reflects a growing emphasis on the broad spectrum of instructional and organizational skills needed to create environments that minimize disruptive behavior (Brophy, 1982; Jones, 1980; Jones, 1982).

Recent work in the field of classroom management has taken three general forms, which we label 1) models, 2) paradigms and 3) systems. Each approach has been influenced by broad social trends, pressure from practitioners, and scholarly work outside of education. Each form has made significant contributions to the understanding and treatment of student behavior problems.

Models

Models are plans of action typically grounded in theory. While they may draw upon a limited research base, generally they lack justification in terms of systematic empirical investigation. Models place major emphasis on how practitioners should respond to disruptive behavior. They often incorporate counseling techniques that call on educators to understand the motives underlying student behavior. Many contemporary models can be traced to work in psychology during the late sixties and early seventies - a time when personal growth and

awareness was popular and educators were searching for methods of responding to student disruptions that recognized the legitimacy of some student discontent.

One of the earliest and most widely employed models was William Glasser's Reality Therapy (1965, 1969). Glasser's model derived from the belief that young people need caring professionals willing to assist them in taking responsibility for their behavior and for developing plans for altering unproductive conduct. Rudolf Dreikurs and his associates (1971) developed a somewhat more clinical model based on the belief that acting-out children were making poor choices due to inappropriate notions of how to meet their basic need to be accepted. Dreikurs proposed a variety of methods for responding to children's misconduct, depending upon the perceived goal of the behavior. His model provided teachers and parents with strategies for identifying the causes of student misbehavior, responding to misbehavior with logical consequences and running family and classroom meetings.

Emphasis on "humanistic" psychology was most obvious in the models of self-concept theorists. Initially summarized by LaBenne and Green (1969) and Purkey (1970), this work focused on the relationship between positive student self-concept, student learning, and productive behavior. Theoretical work and limited research, typically of a clinical nature, yielded Gordon's (1974) Teacher Effectiveness Training (TET), Simon's (1972) Values Clarification, and adaptations of Harris' (1969) Transactional Analysis to programs for children and adolescents (Freed 1973, 1976).

The emergence of Canter's Assertive Discipline (1976) in the mid-seventies represented a departure from the models rooted in humanistic psychology and emphasizing concern for student selfconcept. Instead, Assertive Discipline claimed to respond to teacher need for control and consistency. Influenced by alleged teacher frustration over student rights and waning professional discre-

tion, this model called for the delineation of clear rules governing classroom conduct and clear punishments for disobedience. Though claims have been made that Assertive Discipline is based on research, data has never been published.

Paradigms

Partly in response to changing social values and partly as a reaction to the perceived lack of scientific foundation for many models, some researchers began to look closely at what specific teacher behaviors actually were associated with reduced levels of student behavior problems. Their work represented a blending of theory and empirical investigation, and gave rise to several popular paradigms. A paradigm, for our purposes, may be regarded as a framework encompassing a series of experimental or quasi-experimental research studies that share a common set of methodological tools, desired outcomes (dependent variables), and conceptual underpinings.

Behavior modification. Behavior modification predates the recent decade of activity related to classroom management. The first behavioral journal, Behavior Research and Therapy was begun in 1963. The second, The Journal of Applied Behavioral Analysis began in 1968. Special educators were in the vanguard of those interested in applied behavioral techniques. Books focusing on application to special education began to appear in the late sixties (Hewett, 1968). During the seventies these increased in number and began to include work on behavior in regular classrooms (Becker, Engelmann and Thomas, 1975; Walker and Buckley, 1974). Early behavioral work focused almost exclusively on methods for shaping appropriate behavior through adult control of rewards and punishments (Spaulding, 1971), rather than on the appropriateness or quality of environment stimuli. In the seventies, increased emphasis was placed on teaching students to monitor and control their own behavior (Brophy, 1983; Meichenbaum, 1977). This development has been accompanied by an interest in applying behavioral techniques to teaching children social skills

(Hobbs and others, 1980; Goldstein and others, 1980; O'Leary and Dubey, 1979; Rosenbaum and Drabman, 1979).

Teacher effectiveness research. A second paradigm that emerged in the sixties provided an important alternative to the behaviorists' preoccupation with student behavior. The work of Rosenthal and Jacobsen (1968) and Kounin (1970) suggested that student behavior was, at least partially, a function of teacher behavior. Over the last decade, an assortment of teacher-related independent variables have been examined by teacher effectiveness researchers. These include (1) teacher expectations, (2) classroom rules and procedures, (3) the consequences of rule violation, (4) teacher communication skills, (5) teacher reinforcement patterns, (6) various teacher instructional skills, (7) time teachers spend on various organizational and instructional tasks, (8) methods of grouping children for instruction and (9) teacher use of materials matched to student learning styles. Dependent variables have included (1) student achievement, (2) student on-task behavior, (3) observer perceptions of classroom orderliness, (4) student attendance, (5) office referrals, (6) suspensions, and (7) student attitudes. Rather than stressing the influence of consequences, teacher effectiveness researchers have emphasized the influence of stimuli (teacher behaviors) on responses (student behavior and achievement).

An increasingly impressive body of research is accumulating to support the relationship between specific teacher behaviors and student achievement. However, relationships are not always linear and it appears that the effectiveness of many teaching strategies vary according to such context variables as student SES, cognitive level of the instructional task and student cognitive and personal characteristics (Dunn, 1983; Gage, 1983).

Brookover (1978) found that student behavior was influenced by student perceptions of teacher concern for achievement, among other factors. Brookover's

work also suggested that teacher behavior was partly a function of school-level factors, thus contributing to the increased emphasis on another relatively new paradigm based on school effectiveness.

School effectiveness. Relying on correlational techniques (as did their teacher effectiveness counterparts), school effectiveness researchers operated on the premise that student behavior can only be understood in the context of the entire school. Edmonds (1979), for example, found five school factors to be associated with high student achievement: (1) principal's leadership, (2) high expectations for student performance, (3) positive school atmosphere, (4) a consistent, well articulated focus on achievement, and (5) consistent assessment of student progress. Stalling's (1976, 1979, 1981) work on the relationship between school factors and disruptive student behavior suggests that student misbehavior is reduced when students perceive school rules as fair, and are involved in decision making. Her findings also point to the importance of positive staff-administrator relationships. In their frequently referenced study, Rutter and others (1979) reported that several school wide factors were significantly correlated with student achievement and behavior. These factors included high expectations regarding student performance, consistency in teacher expectations and responses to student behavior, responsible, on-task behavior on the part of teachers and high rates of teacher praise.

Research focusing on student perceptions of the quality of school life (QSL) (Epstein, 1981), while not conducted as part of mainstream school effectiveness studies, has reinforced their findings. Work on QSL stresses the interaction between student attitudes, student behavior, and school environment.

Systems

The third approach to classroom management and school discipline - which we refer to as systems - involves comprehensive sets of recommendations designed to

help educators create classroom and schoolwide environments that minimize the likelihood of disruptive behavior. Systems are generally rooted in mixtures of scholarly research and conventional wisdom and aimed at establishing organizational mechanisms for preventing and responding to unproductive conduct. Unlike some of the approaches described earlier, systems do not concentrate exclusively on prevention strategies nor do they rely on a single theory or line of research for justification. While placing a heavy emphasis on prevention, they tend to accept the assumption that some behavior problems are inevitable, no matter how well-designed the environment. Seeing that these problems are handled quickly and effectively is an important focus of systemic approaches.

Madeline Hunter's Instructional Theory Into Practice (ITIP) places a heavy emphasis on instructional and organizational skills and rigorous staff development. Project TEACH (Teacher Effectiveness and Classroom Handling) provides skill development in instruction and problem solving with an emphasis on counseling and group dynamics techniques. Jones and Jones' (1981) Responsible Classroom Management (RCM) offers a blend of classroom climate, instructional, problem solving and behavioristic skills. Finally Duke's (1980) Systematic Management Plan for School Discipline (SMPSD) grows out of organizational theory and focuses on understanding the school as a complex organization and expanding school capacity for conflict resolution.

Assessing the Study of Student Behavior

The preceding review of scholarly developments suggests that the last decade has witnessed the creation or refinement of a variety of ways to look at and think about student behavior. Researchers have tried to understand student behavior by investigating the contingencies of reinforcement, student motives, teacher behavior, and school organization. Prescriptions have ranged from quasi-clinical approaches based on a sympathetic understanding of the difficulties of growing

up to relatively impersonal and highly formalized procedures designed to help educators maintain control. Each of the three major types of scholarship has made a contribution. Unfettered by the need to collect large amounts of empirical data, model-developers have been able to think creatively and benefit from clinical work (N-1 studies). Researchers working within particular paradigms, on the other hand, have provided us with information indicating the key teacher and institutional factors that effect students' behavior. Work on systems promises to provide guidelines for reorganizing schools and classrooms in an effort to minimize the likelihood of consistent behavior problems.

While we can safely say that the knowledge base regarding student behavior has increased enormously since 1970, we cannot declare that consensus exists about the best way to handle or even to study behavior problems. Our review of models, paradigms, and systems has yielded, however, some observations concerning unresolved issues in research and prescriptions related to student behavior. These issues include: (1) how to define student behavior problems, (2) appropriate units of analysis, (3) the relatively amoral nature of classroom discipline research and theory, (4) the gap between research in classroom management and findings in cognitive and developmental psychology, (5) the absence of cross-fertilization among models, paradigms and systems, (6) the seductiveness of appeals for consistency, and (7) the lack of comparative data from non-conventional schools.

Perhaps the single biggest issue facing researchers is what, exactly, should they study when they investigate classroom management and school discipline. Student behavior is affected by a variety of factors including student attitudes, ability, and developmental stage, family conditions, community conditions, teacher behavior, peer behavior, curriculum, and school organization. Over the past decade researchers have studied these variables singularly and in various combinations. However, to adequately assess each variable and then ascertain its relative impact on student behavior is a highly complex task, particularly when most of the variables are constantly changing. Is it productive to try and apply sophisticated statistical techniques to the separation of influences on student behavior when they, in reality, operate simultaneously?

Associated with the complexity of independent variables is the question of what constitutes a student behavior problem. "Student behavior problem" is not a unitary construct. Some researchers tend to lump together under the rubric of "discipline problems" behaviors as distinct as tardiness, answering questions out of turn, profanity, and vandalism. Others prefer to concentrate on a single type of behavior problem. We know more about the problems that researchers regard as serious than we know about the perceptions of those who deal with behavior problems - teachers, counselors, administrators. Do these individuals find it useful to differentiate between acts of disobedience? Further, are such acts when they occur at home or in the community to be treated, for research purposes, in a manner similar to acts that take place in school? To what extent, for instance, do students who fail to complete assignments in school also fail to finish work elsewhere? Do young people who talk out of turn also cut class, or do different acts of misconduct tend to characterize different types of student?

These questions illustrate a second issue for researchers - the unit of analysis problem. What is the most appropriate unit of analysis for the study of student

behavior problems - the individual student, dyads or triads, the peer group or age cohort, the classroom, the student body of a school? Should we focus only on how a young person behaves in school or should our lens be widened to take in extra-school behavior? Depending on the purpose of the research, it might be quite relevant to note that a student who is chronically tardy for classes is always on time for events outside of school. Limiting the unit of analysis to the classroom invariably implies that the teacher bears the major responsibility for student behavior. But what of the impact of school organization or community expectations on the behavior of teachers? Selection of a unit of analysis is a decision with potentially far-reaching political and policy as well as research implications. An in-depth discussion of these implications is needed to guide future inquiry.

A third issue concerns the amoral nature of much of the research on classroom management and school discipline. This research has tended to look for what "works." Supposedly neutral terms like effectiveness and efficiency are employed to describe criteria used to judge performance. Research findings are rarely subjected to review using philosophical or legal criteria. Thus, time for student learning may be judged to be "wasted" when a teacher stops class to inquire about an upset prompting a student to be uncooperative. From the perspective of developmental psychology or on the basis of fairness, however, it may be very important for a troubled student to have the chance to express himself.

Closely related to the preceding issue is the frequent lack of connection between classroom management/school discipline research and work in cognitive and human development. The latter has suggested, for example, that students often experience failure, develop poor self-concepts as learners, and become disenchanted with school because the material they are asked to study is inappropriate for their level of cognitive development (Toepfer, 1979) and the

ways they are taught ignore how children in various age groups (Lybee & Sund 1982) or with varying learning styles (Dunn, 1983) learn. Similarly, classroom management strategies often follow general prescriptions without attention to the unique needs of specific student populations (Jones, 1983a; 1983b). Many teaching methods provide optimal learning environments for very small percentages of students. From a slightly different perspective, developmental psychologist David Elkind, in The Hurried Child (1981), argues that schools, the media, and parents are moving children too rapidly through childhood. He maintains that children are suffering cognitively and emotionally because adults are asking them to do too much, too soon and without the necessary adult support.

Work such as Elkind's needs to inform research and development efforts in classroom management and school discipline. An ancedote illustrates why a developmental perspective would be of potential value. One of the authors recently worked with a fifth grade teacher experiencing considerable management problems. The teacher had a class of 33 students - 21 of whom were boys and six of whom would be classified as having moderate to severe behavior problems. Supervisory observations indicated that the teacher needed to improve her skill in a variety of areas identified by the teacher effectiveness research as well as several models. Of equal importance, however, was that some of her problems stemmed less from her teaching skills than from the overall context in which her students were placed. They were required to work on five subjects from 9:00 a.m. until 12:30 p.m. with no break. Some students were cognitively unprepared to tackle certain assignments while the seatwork-oriented instruction clearly ran counter to numerous students' preferred learning style. Some students lacked the maturity to ask for help or organize their time productively. Additionally, because students had to change classrooms four to five times each morning, the teacher was compelled to provide instruction within short time segments.

Minimal integration of cognitive and developmental psychology, on the one hand, and classroom management and school discipline research, on the other, is symptomatic of a greater problem - the lack of intentional cross-fertilization among various models, paradigms, and systems. So, for example, behavior modifiers rarely cite the literature on teacher and school effectiveness. Advocates of Assertive Discipline fail to acknowledge similarities between their model and behavioral prescriptions. Teacher and school effectiveness researchers, by concentrating on student achievement as their primary dependent variable, overlook the work of colleagues who point out the importance of developing self-esteem and good character. Staff development programs for teachers and administrators rarely expose participants to a variety of responses to student behavior problems.[1] Our contacts over the years with teacher educators and practitioners suggest, in fact, that most individuals have a very limited perception of the alternatives available.

A sixth issue emerging from our review of recent scholarship in classroom management and school discipline concerns consistency. We are hard-pressed to find studies that do not prescribe the consistent enforcement of rules and application of punishments. Yet, the seeming consensus about the virtues of consistency belie the complexity of students, teachers, and schools. Teachers, for example, are both civil servants and professionals. The former are expected to treat all clients equally; the latter are expected to treat all clients as individuals. Just how certain are we that a teacher should treat two disruptive students the same? Does it matter that one is a mainstreamed student with a history of emotional problems (Dagley, 1982)? Are the ages, cultural backgrounds,

---

[1] For an in-depth discussion of alternative ways to deliver staff development in classroom management, see Daniel L. Duke and Adrienne M. Meckel, Teacher's Guide to Classroom Management (New York: Random House, 1983).

and previous disciplinary records of the students relevant? Simple prescriptions such as consistent discipline are seductive, but they require more thorough examination than they so far have received. Similarly, many prescriptions stemming from teacher effectiveness research suggest that a consistent pattern of teacher behavior will optimize student achievement. However, an increasing body of research relating student achievement to varying teacher and student context variables indicates that the effectiveness of various teacher behaviors and instructional approaches depends upon such factors as the desired cognitive outcomes and the students being taught (Soar , 1983).

A final issue involves the settings in which scholarship concerning student behavior problems has been done. Most of the models, paradigms, and systems currently available have been based on work done in conventional public elementary and high schools or in residential treatment facilities for troubled youth. Little is known about behavior problems or their treatment in other settings - middle and junior high schools, alternative schools, parochial and private day schools,

and boarding schools. Since it seems reasonable to expect behavior to be a function, in part, of environment, more studies in non-conventional settings clearly would be of value.

Have Schools Changed?

Having described the tremendous increase in professional and political activity related to classroom management and school discipline as well as the equally impressive growth in scholarship concerning student behavior problems, it now is appropriate to ask - Are schools any different? In other words, would a school visitor in the eighties see anything different from what would have been seen in 1970? Are students behaving differently? Are teachers performing their professional duties differently? Are schools themselves - as complex organizations - any different?

To address these questions we must make a number of inferences, since there are no longitudinal studies that permit a direct comparison between schools in 1970 and schools in 1980. We also recognize the fact that any changes which may be inferred from available information would not necessarily prove that the intense activity of the last decade was the cause. Other factors - declining enrollment, population shifts, historical events - ultimately could have played a greater role. Still, it would be unfortunate to allow an era such as the seventies to pass without engaging in some cautious speculation about impact.

Focus and Level of Concern

Some of the most obvious changes during the past decade have been in the ways educators, parents, community groups, politicians, and students themselves respond to behavior problems. For example, whereas near-panic often characterized reactions a decade ago, today's educator is more apt to respond by carefully marshalling resources, involving various role groups, acquiring necessary skills, and planning

ways to minimize the likelihood behavior problems will get out-of-hand. Special task forces and interest groups are formed. Training programs have been developed and offered to educators. Efforts are made to delineate and clarify the salient legal issues regarding classroom management and school discipline. While we cannot say that the level of educator concern over student behavior is greater today than it was in 1970, we do observe an increasing level of professionalism on the part of those seeking to reduce behavior problems.

At least four sets of practical issues have emerged as schools struggle to cope with student management problems - organizational, pedagogical, legal and moral. The breadth of concern represented by these issues indicates that dealing with student behavior has become a complex undertaking. For better or worse, conceptions of discipline as a simple matter to be resolved between teacher and student belong in the realm of educational history and folklore.

A major organizational issue associated with classroom management involves the goals of schooling. What is the relationship between student behavior and student achievement? As educators and the general public grow more "outcome" conscious, pressure has built to link whatever occurs in school to the "bottom line" of achievement. Whereas good school conduct once may have been valued as an end in itself, it now tends to be desired as a means to more efficient and effective learning. Thus, a teacher skilled in classroom management is one who devotes a minimum amount of time to maintaining order. Jane Stallings contends, on the basis of her research, that effective secondary reading teachers spend no more than 15 percent of their time on classroom management.[1] Classroom management models that call for a continuing and substantial commitment of teacher energy tend to be abandoned in favor of approaches that maximize time for direct instruction.

From a pedagogical point of view, student behavior is increasingly regarded

---

1 Presentation by Jane Stallings to the Oregon Educational Research Association, October 30, 1982.

as a key barometer of instructional skill and curricular relevance. When students misbehave in class, teachers are encouraged to consider how their own actions might serve as contributing factors. Blaming student behavior problems solely on poor parenting, socioeconomic status, cultural differences, and other exogenous factors may not have disappeared from educators' discussions, but it has become less acceptable. Preventive classroom management skills are becoming a major focus of teacher training, supervision, and evaluation. It would be a mistake, though, to assume that general agreement exists concerning the best way to train competent classroom managers.

Legal issues have come to play a major role in the thinking of educators. An emphasis on student rights has forced teachers to rethink their traditional exercise of *in loco parentis* authority. Freedom of speech, the appropriateness of punishments, and due process in cases of suspension are but a few of the legal issues that have surfaced in recent years. Educators recently have begun to counter the student rights movement with greater stress on student responsibilities.

Concern over legal matters is closely related to the emergence of moral issues related to classroom management. To what extent should students be responsible for their own conduct? Is it fair to create restrictive rules for all students when only a few are disruptive? Educators debate whether the school is or should be engaged in moral instruction.

While these and other practical issues have surfaced (or re-surfaced) during the past decade, they have by no means been resolved. The persistence of certain problems is due, in part, to the lack of consensus among relevant role groups about what constitutes a priority concern. For example, one of the authors (Duke, 1978) found that while administrators, teachers, and students are all disturbed about discipline problems, the particular problems absorbing their attention varies. Administrators often worry most about attendance problems, teachers about disrespect for authority and classroom disruption, and students about theft, fight-

ing, and name-calling. Self-interest seems to dictate which behavior problems rate the most concern - a fact that may explain why students often perceive school and classroom rules to exist less for their benefit than the protection and convenience of adults.

Perceptions of the seriousness of behavior problems differ between educators and the general public as well as among educators. Since 1979, a sample of school officials has been asked a set of questions parallel to those in the annual Gallup Polls (Duea, 1982). While the public ranked lack of discipline and drug use as the number one and two problems facing U.S schools, school officials ranked them far down the list of eighteen problems.[1] The primary worry of the latter group was inflation and financial support for schools. Interestingly, a study of teacher perceptions of school discipline in a Mideastern metropolitan area suggest that teachers may be more in agreement with the public than with school officials (Levin, 1980). Again using the Gallup Poll data, it was found that 60% of the teachers agreed that public concern over discipline is warranted. Further, 82% of the teachers indicated that teachers, administrators, students, and parents have different concepts of what constitutes a discipline problem and what are the appropriate corrective measures.

Besides the Gallup Polls and their derivatives, a number of major surveys have called upon educators and others to assess the overall state of school discipline. Taken together (see Table I), data from these surveys provide some indication of which behavior problems over the years have caused teachers and administrators the most concern.

---

[1] These findings are supported by a recent Washington Post - ABC News poll of perceptions of serious behavior problems by principals and the general public (Education Week, October 26, 1982, p. 7).

	% Who Felt Problem Was "Major"	
	Principals	General Public
Drug abuse	12	66
Alcohol abuse	13	49
Truancy	20	40
Weapons possession	4	25
Fighting	2	31

Table 1

Summary of Survey Data on School Discipline

STUDY	YEAR PUBLISHED	RESPONDENT GROUP	BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS ACCOUNTING FOR CONCERN
Safe School Study [1]	1978	Secondary students	Theft (11% of students) Assaults (1.3% of students)
		Secondary teachers	Theft (12% of teachers) Assaults (.5% of teachers)
		Elem. and Secondary Principals	Trespassing Breaking and Entering (10% of schools) Theft of School Property Vandalism (25% of schools report one act of vandalism a month)
High School '77[2]	1978	High School Principals	Student apathy (a serious problem for 41% Truancy (a serious problem for 35%) Cutting Classes (a serious problem for 30% Student disruptiveness (a serious problem for 7%
AASA Study[3]	1980	Superintendents	Problems in order of severity: Student apathy and lack of motivatio Smoking Insubordination Use of marijuana Use of alcohol Tardiness Truancy Class cutting Vandalism Theft of student property
NCES Study[4]	1982	High School Administrators	"Most serious" problems: Absenteeism Use of drugs or alcohol Class cutting

Table I continued

STUDY	YEAR PUBLISHED	RESPONDENT GROUP	BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS ACCOUNTING FOR CONCERN
PROBE Survey [5]	1982	School administrators and Board Members	Problems in order of severity: Student apathy and truancy Use of alcohol Lack of discipline Use of drugs Crime and vandalism

1. Violent Schools-Safe Schools, The Safe School Study Report to the Congress (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, 1978).

2. Susan Abramowitz and Ellen Tenenbaum, High School '77 (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1978).

3. Student Discipline: Problems and Solutions (Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators, 1980).

4. Discipline, Order and Student Behavior in American High Schools (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1982).

5. Jerry Duea, "School Officials and the Public Hold Disparate Views on Education," Phi Delta Kappan, vol. 63, no. 7 (March 1982), p. 477.

While comparisons of these surveys must be made with caution, since they entail different foci, sampling strategies, and modes of analysis, they do tend to suggest that the target of educators' concern has been shifting. Worry over student unrest and demonstrations opened the decade (Rubel, pp. 96-97), but turned to fear of violence and vandalism by the mid-seventies - a change reflected in the emphasis of The Safe School Study. By the latter part of the decade, student apathy and absenteeism - more passive behavior problems - seemed to have replaced criminal misconduct as the primary focus of educational concern. What remains unclear is whether these apparent shifts in concern represent actual changes in student behavior due to intervention efforts, redefinition of school and community priorities, or simply tacit admission by officials that no more could be done to further reduce specific behavior problems.

Changes in Student Behavior

It is easier to chart changes in perceived concerns than it is to demonstrate actual shifts in patterns of behavior. Few efforts have been made to collect data on student behavior over time in the same school settings. We possess no set of statistics comparable to national averages on the Scholastic Aptitude Test to permit us to reliably trace changes in student behavior. Even longitudinal studies would be subject to cautious interpretation, since any changes they might reveal could derive more from improvements in data collection methods or varying perceptions of the severity of certain behaviors than from changes in the frequency of specific acts.

In spite of these caveats, some tentative inferences regarding trends in student behavior may be justified. We rely on several sources of data: statistics on juvenile delinquency and student misconduct, reviews of selected research findings, news coverage of discipline issues in major educational journals, and our own contacts with educators over the last decade.

Student attitudes generally are regarded as major influences on student behavior. Therefore, it is reasonable to consider whether major attitude changes have been reported. In reviewing trends in student attitudes, Epstein (1981) suggests that student attitudes toward school have been fairly constant over the past several decades.

When Jan Norman and Myron Harris (1981) surveyed 160,000 teen-agers for their book, The Private Life of the American Teenager, 55 percent of the students polled stated that they cheated in school. Only 42 percent of those sampled described school as necessary. In addition, 27 percent stated that school was "boring," while only 21 percent viewed school as "interesting." Data from John Goodlad's "A Study of Schooling" (Benham, Giesen and Oakes, 1980) indicated that 7 percent of secondary students list their courses as the "one best thing about their school," and a University of Michigan study of high school seniors (Morgan,1981) reported that the number of students who think what they learn in school is "very important" decreased from 70 percent to 50 percent between 1969 and 1980. Six out of every ten students in the Norman and Harris sample stated that they studied primarily to pass tests. In a survey by the National Center for Educational Statistics (Morgan, 1981), over half of all high school seniors involved stated they found their part-time jobs to be more enjoyable than their school work. Attitudinal data such as these may explain, in part, why absenteeism and the drop-out rate continue to be a concern to educators. One out of every twelve students in the U.S. is absent from school every day (one out of every five in Boston and New York) and 25 percent of white students, 44 percent of blacks and 46 percent of Hispanic students drop out of school.[1] A rising dropout rate could foreshadow fewer student behavior problems, if the students who are leaving would have been disruptive had they remained in school.

Statistics on juvenile delinquency support the concerns indicated in the

---

[1] U.S. News and World Report, September 1981.

attitudinal surveys. Juvenile delinquency data include crimes committed outside schools as well as inside, suggesting general trends in youthful conduct. They have the advantage of being collected and reported annually. Figures on children's cases disposed of by juvenile courts are illustrative.

Juvenile Court Cases[1]

	1960	1970	1975	1976	1979
Population 10-17 years old (1,000)....	25,368	32,614	33,045	30,836	28,713
Delinquency cases excluding Traffic (1,000).....	510	1,052	1,317	1,432	1,374
Per 1,000 population 10-17 years old	20.1	32.3	39.9	46.2	47.8
Male (1,000).....	415	800	1,002	1,093	1,058
Female (1,000).....	99	252	315	339	316

The data indicate that 1976 was the peak year for number of delinquency cases, but when declining population is taken into account (by calculating cases per 1,000 for 10-17 year olds), it becomes clear that juvenile delinquency has continued to grow. In 1979, almost 48 young people out of every 1,000 were tried in juvenile court, more than double the number in 1960. Also worth noting is the increasing percentage of juvenile cases involving girls. Unfortunately, the statistics are not reported in terms of specific crimes, so it it impossible to determine if the severity of behavior problems has changed along with the frequency.

[1] Statistical Abstract of the United State 1981, 102nd Edition (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1981), p. 188.

Some of the most complete statistics on specific school crimes have been kept by the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools.[1] Between 1973 and 1979, assaults on certificated personnel climbed from 440 to 671 and assaults on pupils from 1192 to 2361. Weapons possession cases dropped over the same time period from 849 to 688. Vandalism increased 38 percent over the six years, and the dollar value of losses jumped 61 percent.

In The Unruly School, Robert Rubel (1977) compiles a variety of trend data related to criminal conduct on campus. Estimates of the number of teachers assaulted annually grew from 18,300 in 1955-56 to 64,100 in 1973-74 and then tapered off a bit to 52,000 in 1974-75 (p. 133). Data collected from secondary teachers as part of N.I.E.'s Safe School Study and reported in 1978 indicated that only .5 percent or 5,200 of the nations's one million secondary teachers had been attacked, a figure far below those collected by the National Center for Education Statistics (reported in Rubel). In 1980, however, the annual Teacher Opinion Poll conducted by the National Education Association indicated that 113,000 teachers reported being attacked by students during the preceding year.[2] Of these 2,500 were seriously injured and 45,000 suffered emotionally. In 90 percent of the cases neither school personnel nor police filed charges, and in a quarter of the cases no disciplinary action was taken against students. Faced with an unpublished 1981 report indicating, among other things, that an average of 24 teachers and 215 students were attacked daily in California schools, State Superintendent of Schools Wilson Riles characterized the situation as "out of hand."[3]

---

1 Our appreciation to Glen Scrimger of the Crime Prevention Center, Office of the Attorney General, State of California, for these data.

2 "New Teacher Poll Documents Assaults," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 62, no. 4 (December 1980), p. 238.

3 Charles C. Hardy, "Report Reveals Alarming Level of Violence in State's Schools," San Francisco Sundy Examiner Chronicle (August 16, 1981), pp. A10-A11.

Rubel presents data on the costs of vandalism as reported annually in School Product News (1977, p. 144). The average dollar cost per district for vandalism, arson, and theft dropped from $55,000 in 1970-71 to $52,652 in 1974-75. In 1975, the nation's three largest school districts - New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago- paid $12.00, $14.00 and $18.50 per student, respectively, to cover the costs of vandalism and security. This represented a total outlay of 31 million dollars (Neill, 1978, p. 302). By 1979, some large city districts were reporting that efforts to reduce the costs of vandalism were paying off. Oakland, California, for example, inaugerated incentives for schools which succeeded in curbing vandalism. Eighty percent of Oakland's schools were able to reduce the costs of vandalism by $234,409 over a two year period, thereby providing almost $160,000 in incentive funds for these schools and their students (Hills, 1980, pp. 12-13).

In New York City, the United Federation of Teachers has kept statistics on school violence since 1972. The 1981-82 figures, for the first time in a decade, indicated a sharp drop in the incidence of violence directed against teachers and other staff members.[1] The total number of reported assaults, robberies, larcenies, and other incidents decreased 22%, from 3,534 to 2,730 (including 1,639 physical attacks on staff members). Union representatives attributed the lowered crime figures in part to efforts by the Board of Education to improve school security. The campus security force has been enlarged from 455 to 1,705 and has begun patrolling junior highs as well as high schools.

The statistics concerning crimes on campus generally are not heartening. While efforts to reduce violence and vandalism seem to be working in some instances, these problems contine to worry both professionals and the public. The relationship between campus crime and classroom management problems is still somewhat unclear, but

---

[1] "N.Y. Union Reports Drop in Violence," Education Week, Vol. 1, no. 40 (August 18, 1982), p. 2.

it seems reasonable to presume that schools marked by high levels of violence and vandalism are more likely to have high rates of classroom disruption, disrespect for authority, and absenteeism.

Despite all the efforts to control student behavior during the seventies, it thus would seem that discipline problems have continued to occur in sufficient numbers to trouble many educators. The persistence of these problems does not mean, however, that their nature may not be undergoing certain changes. Concern, for example, seems to be shifting from high school to junior high school. Studies indicate junior high students now are more likely to be victimized (National Institute of Education, 1978) and suspended (Kaeser, 1979) than older students. Such findings may mean many things, including a change in the age at which young people begin to challenge authority, increasing maturity on the part of older adolescents, less intensive efforts to control behavior problems in junior high and middle schools, or the fact that many students who are experiencing failure and frustration in school are prevented from dropping out until they turn sixteen.

The percentage of behavior problems involving girls also seems to be growing (Duke, 1978b). Whereas in past years problems were generally limited to absenteeism and pregnancy, girls today are engaged in more fighting, gang activity, and classroom disruptions. A recent report (National Center for Education Statistics, 1982) using data collected from 58,270 students in 1,015 schools indicated that rates of absenteeism and class cutting among sophomore boys and girls were comparable.

Another disciplinary issue is the disproportionately large percentage of minority students who are subject to disciplinary action (Kaeser, 1979; Lifler, 1979). Since there is not a legally defensible reason for expecting minority students to misbehave any more than nonminority students, the fact that they are suspended and expelled so much may suggest discriminatory practices on the part of educators. In 1982 Louisville, Kentucky, became the most recent city school system to be forced to develop a district-wide conduct code as a result of a law suit alleging racial bias

in discipline (Education Week, November 24, 1982, p. 4).

Despite the emergence of serious issues such as those just mentioned and notwithstanding the data on campus crime, there are some reasons for many educators to feel encouraged. They may be heartened, for example, by recent reports from the National Institute on Drug Abuse (Mirga, 1982). Statistics indicate that teenagers are moderating their use of illicit drugs. Cigarette smoking, long a source of discipline problems for secondary school administrators, also is declining.

Furthermore, an increasing number of case studies, anecdotal articles, and field reports indicate that particular schools and districts are achieving success in reducing the frequency and severity of misconduct. One Phi Delta Kappan article about an inner-city middle school (Sanders and Yarbrough, 1976) reported how Project ORDER reduced discipline problems by 63 percent, referrals to the principal by 17%, and suspensions by 20 percent. Epstein (1981) identified a variety of programs which have succeeded in improving student perceptions of the "quality of school life" through such interventions as greater student involvement in decision making. The literature on school effectiveness, discussed in the preceding section, presents evidence of many schools where an orderly atmosphere has been created and students for the most part are productive. Efforts to identify and publicize schools that "work" have been stepped up - an indication that educators are tiring of troubled schools getting most of the media coverage (Benjamin, 1981). The compilers of the data in the 1982 NCES report conclude that "student misbehavior is still a major problem for American high schools," but that evidence also exists that "many students do conform to school rules, and that many schools have orderly environments." (pp. 23-24).

Changes in Educators

The preceding section may be somewhat discouraging in that it fails to offer proof that all the attention devoted to classroom management and school discipline during the seventies produced widespread improvements. It could be argued, of course,

that a decade is too brief a period to expect sweeping changes in youthful behavior patterns and that out-of-school factors confuse the effects of school interventions. Since most school-influenced change must begin with changes in teacher and administrator behavior, it may be more reasonable to examine the impact of recent efforts on educators.

Unfortunately it is difficult to say much more about educators than that many of them have been exposed to a variety of information concerning student behavior problems through an assortment of opportunities - workshops, conferences, preservice and inservice courses, research reports, journal articles, and books of practical tips. Despite a decade of research and proliferation of inservice programs, many teachers still seem to possess a limited set of understandings and skills regarding classroom management. Brophy and Rohrkemper (1981) interviewed and observed 44 inner-city and 54 small town teachers, all of whom had three or more years experience. Half of the teachers were nominated by their principals as being outstanding in handling problem students, while half were rated as having average management skills. Few of these teachers had systematic or comprehensive preservice or inservice training in classroom management. Even the most effective classroom managers employed a potpourri of management tricks and could not clearly articulate their approach to student behavior problems. Our own experiences working with teachers strongly support Brophy and Rohrkemper's findings. Teachers typically have been exposed to one-day workshops with little follow-up. As indicated earlier, they have limited awareness of the variety of models, paradigms, and systems available.

Even in schools where entire staffs have been exposed to systematic training in a particular classroom management model or system, evidence of widespread commitment to the approach after a few years usually is difficult to find. Administrator and teacher turnover reduces the likelihood that staff training will be followed up or reinforced over time. Other reasons for the failure of inservice activities to substantially alter the behavior of educators include the low quality of the

activities themselves and the absence of mechanisms to ensure accountability. A recent investigation of staff development conducted by the National Institute of Education has concluded that most inservice is a "trivial and fruitless waste of money."[1]

School organization can contribute to the difficulties of retraining educational personnel. Most school environments are not organized to encourage ongoing, meaningful dialogue on substantive issues. Teachers have minimal time for planning and professional growth and are isolated during most of the day. Their interactions generally focus on short-term bureaucratic matters rather than systematic training and dialogue. The school effectiveness literature has stressed the key role of the principal in guiding the development of teachers as competent classroom managers (Duke, 1982). Many principals, however, fail to function as instructional leaders who help teachers clarify expectations, establish classroom rules, and respond to student concerns. At the secondary level, many teachers either do not regard the maintenance of order as one of their primary responsibilities or they agree to control their own students but do little outside of class to support schoolwide discipline policies.

Several recent reports indicate that student behavior problems are contributing to teacher stress and discontent. Feitler and Tokar (1982) found that 58 percent of their sample of teachers ranked "individual pupils who continually misbehave" as the number one cause of job-related stress. Cichon and Koff (1980), in a study of nearly 5,000 Chicago teachers, reported that managing disruptive students ranked second to "involuntarily transferred" as the major cause of stress. The 1982 Gallup Poll suggested that the general public is not unaware of the situation. When asked to indicate the primary reasons why teachers are leaving their jobs, more people cited discipline problems (63%) than any other reason (Gallup, 1982, p. 46).

---

[1] Thomas Toch, "Inservice Efforts Fail a System in Need, Critics Say," Education Week, Vol. II, no. 4 (September 29, 1982), p. 10.

Changes in Schools

While documented improvements in the behavior of students and educators have been elusive, a visitor to a school today would likely see some things he or she would not have encountered in the early seventies. For example, schools today are more likely to display school rules as well as classroom rules. In the case of large urban school systems like Detroit and Cleveland, courts actually have ordered school officials to develop codes of conduct as part of comprehensive desegregation plans. In other instances, teachers - through the collective bargaining process - have demanded that administrators provide schoolwide discipline systems to deal with students who disrupt instruction or threaten school personnel. As a result of the action of a special mayoral committee, every school in New York City will be required by September 1983 to have a comprehensive disciplinary code that lists what the school considers to be misbehavior and what punishment teachers and administrators can use (Education Week, December 8, 1982, p. 14).

Rules and the consequences for breaking them are written in student handbooks, reported to parents in official letters, and taught to students during the first weeks of school. The procedures to be followed by teachers and administrators in resolving disciplinary cases are more likely today to be specified in official documents and communicated regularly to school employees. Organization theorists describe this tendency to specify rules, consequences, and procedures as formalization.

Increased formalization has meant that teachers are more likely to know that there is a definite point beyond which they no longer must deal with a troubled student. For assistance in resolving behavior problems, contemporary teachers can turn to a variety of specialists and resource persons. In fact, the increased division of labor and role specialization related to discipline represent major organizational changes in schools (Duke and Meckel, 1980a; Duke and Meckel, 1980b). Among the role groups that ~~have~~ emerged or expanded during the seventies are campus supervisors, uniformed school security guards, community liaisons, ombudsmen,

social workers, attendance clerks, crisis teachers, in-school suspension supervisors, special guidance counselors, teacher specialists in behaior disorders, and deans of students. Unfortunately, as the number of resource people has grown, so too has the difficulty of locating one individual who is prepared to assume ultimate responsibility for following through on the resolution of a student behavior problem. Increased division of labor often seems to beget more referrals and "passing the buck."

Other changes in schools that have occurred over the last decade as a result of concern over student behavior include the growth of alternative schools for students who are unable or unwilling to conform to conventional school rules (Duke and Perry, 1978) and the introduction into the formal curriculum of material dealing directly with student behavior (Duke, 1978a). Among the new curricular approaches to student behavior are values clarification, moral education, communication and conflict resolution skills, and personal psychology programs. In 1982, New York City high schools announced the requirement of a civics course in which students learn to be good citizens. Course objectives include increased understanding of what it feels like to be a victim.

A number of schools have developed alternatives to traditional school suspension. One alternative calls for students involved in interpersonal conflicts to be referred to a crisis center where they discuss the situation and develop a plan to resolve the problem. Some schools have introduced "in-house" suspension rooms where students spend supervised study time instead of leaving school. A relatively recent development are programs where students apprehended with drugs or alcohol on school property receive several days in a drug education program instead of an extended suspension or expulsion.

An increased amount of community involvement in the resolution of student behavior problems characterizes many school systems. More school officials are insisting that parents and community agencies share "ownership" in disciplinary issues. Task forces have been established to recommend strategies for handling problems,

parents have formed groups to encourage recreational alternatives to drug and alcohol consumption, and adult volunteers have been used by school officials to phone truant students.

Where Are We ?

Despite the variety of activities aimed at increasing understanding of behavior problems and establishing mechanisms for reducing them, the general level of concern regarding student behavior has remained high over recent years. Only the particular behaviors causing greatest worry seem to have changed.

That the literature on classroom management and school discipline presents a rich variety of ways to alter schools in order to minimize behavior problems can hardly be denied. Articles and testimonials describing the successes of individual schools suggest that the legacy of the seventies may not be entirely disappointing. Yet, the very diversity of recommendations made over the past decade may account, in part, for the lack of convincing evidence of major changes in behavior and for the prevailing sense of confusion about how best to address discipline problems.

Consensus concerning how best to respond to student misconduct simply does not exist. Researchers disagree about the proper amount of attention to devote to understanding the etiology of misbehavior, the relative merits of positive reinforcers and punishments, how to train and re-train teachers, and so on. Disagreement exists about whether to stress classroom management or school discipline. Consultants offering particular approaches trade inflated claims, an indication of intensifying competition for shrinking staff development dollars. In a real sense, there are too many systematic approaches.

What is missing are guidelines to help educators differentiate between competing approaches and to select methods most appropriate for their particular grade level, subject matter area or community. Confronted daily with students of different ages, cultures, and ability levels, teachers resist, perhaps wisely, blanket panaceas that speak to all elementary or secondary educators. Combined with a lack of funds, time,

and training to sort-out appropriate management techniques, teachers and administrators increasingly look with dismay at the array of classroom management tips and grow skeptical of new ideas.

Our search for indications of widespread changes in student and teacher behavior as a result of all the acitivities of the seventies thus has failed to yield convincing evidence. If changes have occurred anywhere, they have been in school organization. Yet even here, a cynical observer might argue that developing and posting school rules, creating specialized roles, setting up in-house suspension programs, and the like do more to create the illusion of change than actually to foster change. Believing that they alone can do little to combat society-wide shifts in values and youthful behavior patterns, some educators could be spawning organizational changes mostly to protect themselves from accusations of unresponsiveness. Several scholars conclude that, despite years of organizational tinkering, schools remain strikingly the same (Cuban, 1982; Sarason, 1981; Wagenaar, 1981).

We do not necessarily agree that educators promote superficial organizational change out of self-interest, knowing that the likelihood that such change will succeed is slight. There are other possible explanations for our failure to locate evidence of widespread changes in behavior during the seventies and early eighties. While this is not the place to examine these alternative explanations in depth, we would like to list several possibilities:

1. Significant changes have been introduced in schools and classrooms, but insufficient time has elapsed for them to produce changes in behavior.

2. Problems exist with the various models, paradigms, and systems. They are too narrowly conceived, too doctrinaire, or too unmindful of the realities of schools.

3. The prescriptions are sound but problems exist with efforts to disseminate them. Qualified trainers, local resources, administrative support and financial support are lacking.

4. Teachers and administrators are unwilling or unable to change the ways they deal with student behavior problems.

5. It is unrealistic to expect school-based innovations to produce lasting changes in behavior because the context within which schools exist is constantly changing. Schools reflect more than they shape the greater society.

6. Widespread changes in student and teacher behavior have, in fact, resulted from the efforts of the last decade, but our sources of data are inadequate. At any given time, research tends to focus on or disclose problems rather than improvements.

One other way to account for the persistence of student behavior problems is to argue that schools have a need for and thus "create" their own deviant behavior. In The Wayward Puritans, Kai Erickson applied this thesis to Salem, Massachusetts, to account for the witch problem in colonial times. No systematic effort so far has been mounted to examine the possibility that schools require a certain proportion of disruptive students to permit norms to be delineated and enforced. One of the authors, however, found some confirmation for this provocative thesis when he was invited to set up a school-within-a-school for 35 troubled students in a public high school. No sooner had these "behavior problems" been removed from the mainstream of school life than a new group of comparable size surfaced to replace them.

FUTURE PROSPECTS

So far we have identified issues related to the quality of research on classroom management and school discipline and recent attempts by educators to deal with behavior problems. In addition, we have speculated on some reasons why evidence of widespread improvements in student behavior is scarce. In conclusion, we attempt some troubleshooting, trying to anticipate what issues related to classroom management and school discipline may emerge during the eighties. We focus on the negative impact of teacher shortages and declining resources for schools. The section closes with some recommendations for policymakers committed to reducing disruptive student behavior.

Why Student Misbehavior May Continue to be a Concern

Much of the research which has served as the basis for recommendations regarding sound classroom management and school discipline was conducted in schools characterized by growth or stability. Much of this work presumes the existence of skilled teachers, reasonable class sizes, adequate instructional resources, and support services. The eighties have ushered in a sustained period of declining resources and educational retrenchment. In addition, many schools no longer can count on recruiting talented teachers. These two factors, among others, must be weighed carefully by those hoping to derive suggestions from the growing knowledge base in classroom management and school discipline.

A variety of studies indicate that schools already are having difficulty attracting top candidates, that teacher turnover is high, and that the most talented teachers are likely to leave the profession (Duke, 1983). A recent prediction suggests that from 1984 to 1988 there will be a demand for 861,000 new teachers but a supply of only 780,000 (Dearman and Plisko, 1980). Findings from the annual Gallup Poll suggest a diminishing interest in teaching as a career. In answer to the question: "Would you like to have a child of yours take up teaching in the public schools as a career?" the percentage of individuals responding "yes" dropped from 75% to 48% between 1969 and 1980 (Gallup, 1980). Sadly, almost identical results were obtained when Phi Delta Kappa asked educators whether they would like their child to enter the teaching profession (Elam and Gough, 1980). Weaver (1979) and Vance and Schlechty (1982) report data indicating that the problem is one of quality as well as quantity. College-bound seniors reporting an interest in teaching careers scored well below the national average on standardized test scores. Weaver also reported that education majors who obtained teaching jobs had lower test scores than those who did not find jobs, and he therefore concluded that the brightest education majors were going into non-education occupations.

While recruitment is one problem, retention may be equally serious. Between 1962 and 1976 the percentage of public school teachers with 20 or more years of experience was reduced by one-half.[1] In a recent National Education Association Survey, forty percent of the teachers sampled stated they had no intention or remaining in teaching until retirement (McGuire, 1979). Unfortunately, teachers who leave may be the more academically gifted (Schlechty and Vance, 1981; Levin, 1974) and the more idealistic and dedicated (Block, 1978).

The human resource problem is closely related to dwindling financial resources. Double-digit inflation in concert with cost-cutting drives such as California's Proposition 13 and Massachusetts' Proposition 2-1/2 have forced many districts to reduce staff, curtail special support programs for students, para elective courses, and cut back staff training. Several studies (Duke, Cohen and Herman, 1981; Duke and Meckel, 1980) have vividly portrayed the problems facing teachers and schools when real per pupil resources are slashed.

Complicating the problem has been the fact that schools often are being asked to provide more services with reduced resources. Elementary teachers frequently teach as many as eleven subject to 30-35 students as well as handling playgound and lunch duties. Public Law 94-142 has led to an increasing number of mildly handicapped children receiving instruction in regular classrooms. Family disruption caused by an increasing divorce rate and economic difficulties mean that teachers are faced with many children who are emotionally distraught, lacking in self-discipline, and desperately in need of adult support. When these factors are accompanied by demands for increased student productivity and teacher accountability, it is not surprising that teachers leave the field, despite the uncertainty of the economy.

---

1 "Teacher Burnout: How to Cope When Your World Goes Blank," Instructor, Vol. 6, 1976 p. 57.

Signs of teacher burnout abound. In New York in 1979, 51 of 146 disability retirements were for psychiatric or neurologic conditions.[1] A recent survey of 3300 teachers showed that 16% of the teachers sampled rated their job as "extremely stressful" or "very stressful" (Feitler & Toakr, 1982). Studies of inner-city schools suggest that teacher stress is particularly high. Interviews with a random sample of teachers from three New York City high schools indicated that one-third reported suffering from job-related stress and physical ailments (Duke, Cohen and Herman, 1981). In a survey conducted by the Chicago Teachers Union, 56 percent of 5,000 respondents reported physical and/or mental illness as a direct result of their jobs (Cichon and Koff, 1980).

Teacher personnel problems can contribute to student discontent which, in turn, can lead to greater teacher personnel problems. The entire process can be likened to a steadily downward-moving spiral (Duke and Cohen, 1983). The process is exacerbated by growing job insecurity, increasing class sizes, and conflicting expectations. Evidence exists of more capable students withdrawing from troubled public schools (Duke and Meckel, 1980). The future promises fewer and possibly less capable teachers instructing larger classes of less able students with fewer resources and greater public pressure for success.

One problem with situations characterized by the downward spiral is that efforts to provide short-term relief often trigger long-term problems. For example, concern over diminished resources may lead to the neglect of promising new developments that could improve the overall quality of schooling. Important work in such areas as student learning styles, meta-cognition, and training for self-responsibility is not receiving adequate attention from educators, in part because they feel pressed to concentrate available resources on raising test scores and maintaining order. Private industry knows too well the long-term costs of sacrificing new

---

[1] Frances Cerra, "Stress Buffeting Old Teacher Now in Schools," New York Times, October 14, 1980, p. B1.

research and development for short-term efforts to stabilize operations.

Summary and Recommendations

We would be remiss if we concluded this paper with the gloomy prospect that schools in the eighties are destined to be characterized by high levels of student behavior problems and educator frustration. Before offering positive suggestions to those who will chart the course of schooling in the future, however, we need to review what has been gleaned from our assessment of recent efforts to deal with student behavior problems. The following twelve conclusions provide the basis for our recommendations:

1. The knowledge base in classroom management and school discipline has grown considerably since the mid-sixties.

2. Reservations exist concerning the quality of much of the data on student behavior.

3. Perceptions of what constitutes priority student behavior problems vary greatly within and between schools, among various groups, and over time.

4. The level of public and professional concern regarding student behavior continues to be high.

5. School organization and procedures have undergone substantial changes in an effort to reduce concern over student behavior.

6. No consensus exists regarding the best or most effective way to manage classrooms, prevent behavior problems, or coordinate school discipline.

7. No consensus exists regarding the best way to train prospective or veteran educators in classroom management and school discipline.

8. Programs to improve student behavior rarely reflect a sensitivity to differences in student ability, age, level of maturation, cultural background, family circumstances, previous school experience, or handicaps.

9. Classroom management frequently is conceptualized solely as a matter of student control rather than a dimension of curriculum, instruction, and overall school climate.

10. There is little evidence of lasting, widespread improvements in student behavior as a direct result of an increased knowledge base, more staff development, and school reorganization.

11. Isolated reports of classrooms and schools where student behavior problems are not a great concern or have been markedly reduced suggest that there is some reason to be hopeful.

12. Declining resources for schools and difficulties with the recruitment of skilled teachers threaten to exacerbate student behavior problems.

Reflecting on these conclusions, we have speculated on what advice we can offer educational policymakers. Making recommendations is, of course, a subjective process - the more so because of the lack of concensus on so many issues pertaining to classroom management and school discipline. Still, at any point in time, despite the lack of unambiguous signals, policies must be determined and schools must be operated. We therefore urge policymakers to consider the following suggestions: 1) systematic assessment of school environments, 2) comprehensive improvement plans based on schoolwide action, 3) more comprehensive staff development, and 4) greater efforts to integrate models, paradigms, and systems. We briefly discuss each and invite our colleagues to use these suggestions as a basis for focused dialogue and inquiry.

Given declining resources for education, it is essential that contemporary school improvement efforts produce positive results. There is little room for well-intentioned, but misguided innovations. Careful planning based on accurate information can mean the difference between successful change and another round of short-lived experimentation. To provide the data needed for planning efforts in the area of classroom management and school discipline, we recommend a systematic assessment of the total school environment. Such an assessment focuses on the collection of as much general descriptive information as possible about current school conditions - student characteristics, teacher performance, curric-

ulum content and adequacy, resource allocation patterns, school climate, organizational structure, and leadership. In addition, data describing specific discipline problems are needed. We must curb the tendency to launch new programs based on political pressure and rumors rather than "hard data."

A clear understanding of what is currently going on in a school is likely to give rise to our second recommendation - improvement plans that encompass comprehensive rather than piecemeal changes. Typically, educators have sought to reduce behavior problems by introducing a new organizational mechanism - such as in-house suspension - or exposing staff members to a new training program. We now know enough about the nature of student behavior problems to realize that different problems and different students are influenced by different aspects of the school environment. Thus, efforts to improve school discipline that do not call for such activities as evaluating the relevance and appropriateness of curriculum content and instructional methods, enlisting community support for new policies, and developing plans of assistance for marginally competent classroom managers may yield disappointing results.

Comprehensive improvement efforts necessitate comprehensive staff development - our third recommendation. Particularly in light of concerns about the quality of teachers currently entering the profession, it is essential that changes in policies regarding classroom management and school discipline be accompanied by well-organized, ongoing training. With mounting public pressure to accomplish more with less, school officials no longer can afford to permit wide variations in understanding and application of effective instructional and classroom management practices across different teachers and classes.

It is fair to maintain that one reason why staff development up to now may have lacked comprehensiveness is related to the confusion among scholars as to how best to manage classrooms. Purveyors of new models and systems have

exchanged competing claims and created new sets of technical terms that inhibit rather than facilitate staff development. Researchers frequently criticize models and systems without offering constructive alternatives. Our final recommendation, therefore, is that efforts be made to encourage scholars, in concert with practitioners, to integrate knowledge from the various models, paradigms, and systems. We need to distinguish effective approaches to student behavior problems from those that simply claim to be effective for promotional purposes. Criteria then must be developed to assist educators in comparing and evaluating alternative approaches. The focus must be on making educators well-informed consumers of technical know-how rather than passive subjects of interventions mandated by higher authorities.

REFERENCES

Abramowitz, Susan and Tenenbaum, Ellen. High School '77: A Survey of Public Secondary School Principals (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1978).

American Association of School Administrators. Student Discipline: Problems and Solutions (Arlington, Va.: American Association of School Administrators, 1980).

Becker, W.; Engelmann, S.; and Thomas, D. Teaching 1: Classroom Management (Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1975).

Benham, B.; Giesen, P.; and Oakes, J. A study of schooling: students' experiences in schools. Phi Delta Kappan 61 (January 1980), 337-340.

Benjamin, Robert. Making Schools Work (New York: Continuum, 1981).

Block, A. Combat neurosis in inner-city schools. American Journal of Psychiatry 135 (1978), 1189-1192.

Brookover, W. Elementary school climate and school achievement. American Educational Research Journal 15 (1978), 301-318.

Brophy, J. Supplemental group management techniques. In Daniel L. Duke (ed.), Helping Teachers Manage Classrooms (Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982).

Brophy, J. and Putnam, J. G. Classroom management in the elementary school. In Daniel L. Duke (ed.), Classroom Management, The Seventy-eighth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979).

Brophy, J. and Rohrkemper, M. The influence of problem ownership on teachers' perceptions of and strategies for coping with problem students. Journal of Educational Psychology 73 (1981), 295-311.

Bybee, R. and Sund, R. Piaget for Educators (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1982).

Canter, L. Assertive Discipline (Los Angeles: Lee Canter Associates, Inc., 1976).

Cichon, D. and Koff, R. Stress and teaching. NASSP Bulletin 64 (1980), 91-104.

Cuban, Larry. Persistent instruction: the high school classroom, 1900-1980. Phi Delta Kappan 64 (1982), 113-118.

Dagley, David L. Some thoughts on disciplining the handicapped. Phi Delta Kappan 63 (1982), 696-697.

Dearman, Nancy B. and Plisko, Valena White. The Condition of Education, 1980 Edition (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980).

Dreikurs, R., Grunwald, B., and Pepper, C. Maintaining Sanity in the Classroom (New York: Harper and Row, 1971).

Duea, Jerry. School officials and the public hold disparate views on education. Phi Delta Kappan 63 (1982), 477-479.

Duke, Daniel L. Can the curriculum contribute to resolving the educator's discipline dilemma? Action in Teacher Education 1 (1978), 17-36.

_____ (ed.). Classroom Management, The Seventy-eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979).

_____. How administrators view the crisis in school discipline. Phi Delta Kappan 59 (1978), 325-330.

_____. Leadership functions and instructional effectiveness. NASSP Bulletin 66 (1982), 1-12.

_____. Managing Student Behavior Problems (New York: Teachers College Press, 1980).

_____. Teaching - The Imperiled Profession (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1984).

_____. Toward responsible innovation. The Educational Forum 42 (1976), 351-372.

_____. Why don't girls misbehave more than boys in school? Journal of Youth and Adolescence 7 (1978b), 141-158.

Duke, Daniel L. and Cohen, Jon. Do public schools have a future? a case study of retrenchment and its implications. Forthcoming.

Duke, Daniel L.; Cohn, Jon; and Herman, Roslyn. Running faster to stay in place: New York Schools face retrenchment. Phi Delta Kappan 63 (1981), 13-17

Duke, Daniel L. and Meckel, Adrienne M. Disciplinary roles in American schools. British Journal of Teacher Education 6 (January 1980), 37-50.

Duke, Daniel L. and Meckel, Adrienne M. The slow death of a public high school. Phi Delta Kappan 61 (1980b), 674-677.

Duke, Daniel L. and Meckel, Adrienne M. Student attendance problems and school organization: a case study. Urban Education 15 (1980c), 325-357.

Duke, Daniel L. and Meckel, Adrienne M. Teacher's Guide to Classroom Management (New York: Random House, 1983).

Duke, Daniel L. and Perry, Cheryl. Can alternative schools succeed where Benjamin Spock, Spiro Agnew, and B. F. Skinner have failed? Adolescence 13 (1978), 375-392.

Duke, Daniel L. and Seidman, William. Are public schools organized to minimize behavior problems? In Daniel L. Duke (ed.), Helping Teachers Manage Classrooms (Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982).

Edmonds, R. Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leadership 37 (1979), 15-18.

Elam, S. and Gough, P. Comparing lay and professional opinion on Gallup Poll questions. Phi Delta Kappan 62 (1980), 47.

Elkind, David. The Hurried Child (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1981).

Epstein, Joyce Levy. The Quality of School Life (Lexington: Lexington Books, 1981).

Erikson, Kai T. Wayward Puritans (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966).

Farrar, Eleanor; DeSanctis, John E.; and Cohen, David K. The lawn party: the evolution of federal programs in local settings. Phi Delta Kappan 62 (1980), 167-171.

Feitler, F. and Tokar, E. Getting a handle on teacher stress: how bad is the problem? Educational Leadership 39 (1982), 456-458.

Feldhusen, John. Problems of student behavior in secondary schools. In Classroom Management, The Seventy-eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979).

Francescani, F. MARC: an affective curriculum for emotionally disturbed adolescents. Teaching Exeptional Children 14 (1982), 217-222.

Freed, A. TA for Teens (Sacramento: Jalmar Press, 1976).

_____. TA for Kids (Sacramento: Jalmar Press, 1977).

Gallup, George H. Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools. Phi Delta Kappan 64 (1982), 37-50.

_____. Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools. Phi Delta Kappan 62 (1980).

Garibaldi, Antoine M. (ed.). In-School Alternatives to Suspension: Conference ence Report (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1979).

Glasser, W. Reality Therapy (New York: Harper and Row, 1965).

Glasser, W. Schools Without Failure (New York: Harper and Row, 1969).

Goldstein, A. Skillstreaming the Adolescent: A Structured Learning Approach to Teaching Prosocial Skills (Champaign, Ill.: Research, 1980).

Gordon, Thomas. T.E.T.: Teacher Effectiveness Training (New York: Wyden, 1974).

Harris, T. I'm OK - You're OK (New York: Harper and Row, 1967).

Hewett, F. The Emotionally Disturbed Child in the Classroom (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1968).

Hills, John J. Incentive program involves students. Campus Strife (1980), 12-13.

Jones, Vernon F. Training teachers to be effective classroom managers. In Daniel L. Duke (ed.), Helping Teachers Manage Classrooms (Alexandria, VA.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982).

_____. Adolescents With Behavior Problems (Boston: Allyn and Bacon. 1980).

_____. Current trends in classroom management: Implications for gifted students. Roeper Review, 1983 in press.

_____. School-wide discipline: Meeting both students' and teachers' needs. Middle School Journal, October 1983.

Jones, Vernon F. and Jones, Louise. Responsible Classroom Discipline Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1981.

Kaeser, Susan C. Suspensions in school discipline. Education and Urban Society 11 (1979), 465-484.

Kounin, Jacob. Discipline and Group Management In Classrooms (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970).

Kurz, Constance G. Long hot summer may be alleviated by Miami schools. Education Week 1 (June 16, 1982), p. 1.

LaBenne, W. and Greene, B. Educational Implications of Self-Concept Theory (Pacific Palisades, CA.: Goodyear Publishing Co., 1969).

Levin, Henry. A cost-effectiveness analysis of teacher selection. In Donald Gerwin (ed.), The Employment of Teachers (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1974).

Levin, James. Lay vs. teacher perceptions of school discipline. Phi Delta Kappan 61 (1980), 360.

Lufler, Henry S. Debating with untested assumptions: the need to understand school discipline. Education and Urban Society 11 (1979), 450-464.

Meichenbaum, D. Cognitive-Behavior Modification (New York: Plenum, 1977).

Mirga, Tom. Rates of teenage drug use shifting downward. Education Week 1 (March 3, 1982), 1.

National Center for Education Statistics. Discipline, Order and Student Behavior in American High Schools (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1982).

National Institute of Education. Violent Schools — Safe Schools, The Safe School Study Report to the Congress (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1978).

Neill, George. Control spectre hovers as HEW requests detailed reports on discipline measures. Phi Delta Kappan 57 (1975), 286.

Neill, Shirley Boes. Violence and vandalism: dimensions and correctives. Phi Delta Kappan 59 (1978), 302-307.

Norman, J. and Harris, M. The Private Life of the American Teenager (New York: Rawson Wade, 1981).

O'Leary, S. and Dubey, D. Applications of self-control procedures by children: a review. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis 12 (1979), 449-465.

O'Leary, S. and O'Leary, K. Behavior modification in the school. In H. Leitenberg (ed.), Handbook of Behavior Modification (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1976).

Pinnell, G. and others. Directory of Schools Reported to Have Exemplary Discipline (Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa International, 1982).

Purkey, W. Self-Concept and School Achievement (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970).

Rollin, Stephen A. The Governor's Task Force on Disruptive Youth. Phi Delta Kappan 56 (1974).

Rosenthal, R. and Jacobson, L. Pygmalion in the Classroom (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968).

Rubel, Robert J. The Unruly School (Lexington: Lexington Books, 1977).

Ruchkin, J. P. Does school crime need the attention of policemen or educators? Teachers College Record 79 (1977), 225-244.

Rutter, M.; Maughan, B.; Mortimore, P.; and Ouston, J. Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Students (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979).

Sanders, Stanley G. and Yarbrough, Janis S. Bringing order to an innercity middle school. Phi Delta Kappan 58 (1976), 333-334.

Sarason, Seymour. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971).

Schlechty, Phillip C. and Vance, Victor S. Do academically able teachers leave education? the North Carolina case. Phi Delta Kappan 63 (1981), 106-112.

Simon, S.; Howe, L.; and Kirschenbaum, H. Values Clarification: A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students (New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1972).

Soar, R. Impact of context variables on teacher and learner behavior. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Detroit, 1983.

Stallings, J. Accountability in teacher education: a diagnostic-prescriptive approach. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Detroit, 1983.

Stallings, J. What research has to say to administrators of secondary schools about effective teaching and staff development. Paper presented at the "Creating Conditions for Effective Teaching" Conference, Eugene, 1981.

Toepfer, C. Brain Growth periodization - a new dogma for education. Middle School Journal 10 (1979), 3, 18-20.

U.S. Department of Commerce. Statistical Abstract of the United States 1981, 102d Edition (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1981).

Vance, Victor S. and Schlechty, Phillip C. The distribution of academic ability in the teaching force: policy implications. Phi Delta Kappan 64 (1982), 22-27.

Wagenaar, T. High School seniors' views of themselves and their schools: a third analysis. Phi Delta Kappan 63 (1981), 29-32.

Walker, H. and Buckley, N. Token Reinforcement Techniques (Eugene, OR.: E-P Press, Inc., 1974).

Walker, H. and others. The SBS Social Skills Curriculum (Eugene, Or.: Center on Human Development, 1981).

Wayson, W. and Pinnell, G. Creating a living curriculum for teaching self-discipline. In Daniel L. Duke (ed.), Helping Teachers Manage Classrooms (Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982).

Weaver, T. In search of quality: the need for talent in teaching. Phi Delta Kappan 61 (1979), 29-32.